

State of Hawaii
Department of Transportation
Highways Division

**Request for Proposal
Scope of Work**

Project Title

Kahekili Highway Improvements
Haiku Road to Kamehameha Highway
Island of Oahu
District of Koolaupoko

Background

An alternatives analysis and environmental document was developed for the purpose of improving transportation capacity needs for the windward corridor on the island of Oahu. To this end, in the June 1990 the Kahekili Highway Widening and Interchange Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) was completed with a Record of Decision (ROD) in December 1990. The corridor limits were from the Likelike Highway and Kahekili Highway junction to the Kamehameha Highway and Kamehameha Highway junction.

The FEIS identified the selected alternative as a full interchange for the Likelike Highway and Kahekili Highway junction and the incremental widening of Kahekili Highway from Likelike Highway to Kamehameha Highway. To date the completed work identified in the FEIS includes an at-grade signalized intersection, the widening of Kahekili Highway between Likelike Highway to Kahuhipa Street from three-lanes to six-lanes, the widening of Kahekili Highway between Kahuhipa Street to Haiku Road from three-lanes to five-lanes, and intersection improvements on Kahekili Highway at Kulukeoe Street, Keaahala Road, Kahuhipa Street and Haiku Road.

Additionally, other improvements along this corridor which were done are improvements at the Hui Iwa Street intersections, improvements at the Kamehameha Highway intersection, and landscaping and American with Disability Act improvements between Kulukeoe Road and Haiku Road.

General Requirements

A. Scope of Work

The State of Hawaii, Department of Transportation (HDOT) is seeking consultant services to complete the next incremental segment of the Kahekili Highway from Haiku Road to Kamehameha Highway. The services to be provided by the consultant will be transportation project planning and preliminary engineering services for the re-evaluation of the 1990 FEIS for the purpose of pursuing and completing the last segment identified in the 1990 FEIS.

The re-evaluation of the FEIS is needed since approximately 20 years have passed since the 1990 FEIS was approved; therefore for practical purposes the re-evaluation of current and future

conditions along this corridor will is being requested. Additionally, this FEIS re-evaluation is required by the U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration if federal funds are to be applied for any subsequent design and construction projects. And, during the re-evaluation process it shall be determined whether the 1990 FEIS is still valid. If the 1990 FEIS is not valid, as part of this scope of work, the required NEPA and HRS 343 processes and documents shall be performed to provide the environmental clearance for the last incremental segment of Kahekili Highway from Haiku Road to Kamehameha Highway.

This FEIS re-evaluation will include the project planning and preliminary engineering analysis that includes alternatives analysis for the entire corridor from Likelike Highway to Kamehameha Highway with emphasis on the segment from Haiku Road to Kamehameha Highway.

The FEIS re-evaluation will include an extensive public and stakeholder coordination effort since any proposed projects may have significant social and economic impacts due to the various uses of Kahekili Highway by its users. Several communities and businesses on the windward side of the island utilize this corridor as a pass through highway while the local communities abutting the corridor use the highway as a local road. The purpose of this coordination effort will be for the comprehensive consideration of the public and stakeholders interests and priorities during this re-evaluation process and in the outcome.

The project planning work includes the analysis of consistency and coordination with relevant planning studies and programs, and the transportation forecast modeling of the regional roadway network.

The preliminary engineering work includes the traffic engineering analysis on the proposed alternatives. The engineering analysis work will include preliminary design, right-of-way assessment, and cost estimation. The alternative analysis will also apply methods to consider the federal requirements and policies; HDOT requirements and policies; all modes of transportation, stakeholders interests and priorities; and social, economic and environmental impacts.

This re-evaluation effort of the 1990 FEIS to be performed by consultant services will be in accordance to Federal and State statutes, policies and guidelines; American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials' (AASHTO) standards; National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) under the provisions of 23 CFR Part 771, Environmental and Related Procedures (NEPA Rules); and the Hawaii Environmental Policy Act under the provisions of the Chapter 343 Hawaii Revised Statutes and Title 11 Chapter 200 Hawaii Administrative Rules (State EIS Rules).

All work performed by consultant services shall be subject to review and approval by HDOT.

Specific tasks to be completed by consultant services:

1. Coordination

- a. Conduct an initial "Kick-off" meeting between HDOT and the Consultant to discuss and clarify the scope of work, work plan, tasks, subtasks, schedule, roles and responsibilities, and administrative issues for the purpose of identifying and

- b. Coordinate and conduct monthly project coordination meetings to review project progress.
 - c. Coordinate and conduct HDOT technical project meetings.
 - d. Coordinate and conduct coordination for the purpose of coordinating technical issues, studies and approvals with the County, State and Federal agencies and utility companies.
 - e. Coordinate and conduct public involvement efforts.
2. Public Involvement – Develop a project public involvement plan for implementation throughout the project process that includes:
- a. Identification of stakeholders, such as community and civic organization, private firms and other parties with an interest or that may be impacted.
 - b. A minimum of three (3) public informational meetings/ public hearings.
 - c. Advisory group meetings, if proposed in submitted RFP proposal.
 - d. Identifies and is performed in compliance with the requirements of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Executive Order 12898 on Environmental Justice.
3. Alternatives Analysis – For each project alternative the following will be considered and included in a technical report for approval by HDOT:
- a. A maximum of six (5) alternatives will be assessed.
 - One (1) alternative will be a “No-Build” project.
 - One (1) alternative will be a Transportation System Management (TSM) project.
 - One (1) alternative will be a Contra-flow project, specifically for Kahekili Highway from Haiku Road to Kamehameha Highway. This contra-flow shall be considered as an alternative phasing plan.
 - b. Existing conditions shall be identified
 - c. Appropriate aerial-photo contour and/or topographic maps of the project area will be obtained. These maps should have a scale equal to or better than 1”=200’.
 - d. The alternatives will be provided on the aerial-photo maps as a result of preliminary investigations and early technical and stakeholder coordination efforts.

- e. Each alternative shall consider and identify the transportation planning; traffic, safety and design engineering; right-of-way; costs; and social, economic and environmental issues.
 - f. Each alternative shall consider current, intermediate and design year traffic projections.
 - g. Each alternative shall have a phasing plan. The phasing plan shall consider intermediate and design year traffic projections; traffic, safety, and design engineering, right-of-way, costs, and social, economic and environmental issues.
 - h. Each alternative and its phased projects shall have a benefit-cost analysis.
 - i. Each alternative report will identify, assess, and address the specific environmental factors, including, but are not limited to, air quality, historical and archaeological resources, botanical resources, coastal aquatic resources and water quality, fauna and avifauna resources, hazardous waste sites, and noise levels – as required by the NEPA rules and the State EIS Rules.
4. Determine the validity of June 1990 FEIS. If the FEIS is valid or not, determine and identify in a report the required NEPA and HRS 343 documents and processes required to pursue the alternative projects selected by HDOT.
 5. If the FEIS is not valid the appropriate NEPA and HRS 343 document shall be prepared as part of this scope of work. In this case, HDOT anticipate that a NEPA Environmental Assessment and HRS 343 Environmental Assessment will be required, which will be determined in item #4 above.

B. Quality Assurance and Quality Control

The consultant shall utilize Quality Assurance and Quality Control (QA/QC) procedures to ensure completeness, accuracy, and quality of all work efforts and submittals made as part of this project.

C. Total Project Time

The project should be completed within two (2) years from the consultant's Notice to Proceed (NTP).

Proposal Content

The proposals shall be in the following format and shall include:

A. Identification

1. Title Sheet, which includes the Project Title
2. Name of Company submitting the proposal, name and title of company officer with legal contractual authority, business address, telephone numbers, email address.

B. Table of Contents

C. Introduction

D. Project Team

1. Identification of the Project Manager, key personnel and subcontractors that will be assigned to the project. The qualifications and experience of each key project team members should be discussed and resumes should be provided.
2. Roles and responsibilities of each key team member and the percentage of effort (time) they will be devoting to the project by specific tasks.
3. An organization chart of the Project Team that clearly identifies their major involvement.
4. Substitutions of identified key personnel, subsequent to the submission of the proposal, are subject to Department approval.

E. Project Proposal

The proposal shall clearly communicate the overall project approach that reflects an understanding of the project and an effective and efficient strategy to accomplish the scope of work on time and on budget. The proposal shall include a Work Plan that identifies the major project tasks, key team members and their involvement, coordination efforts, schedule, and deliverables.

F. Anticipated Problems

The proposal shall identify any potential problem areas anticipated during the course of undertaking the project and possible solutions to remedy any such problems.

G. Project Information Support

The proposal shall identify the information and services which the Proposer expects the Department, the County, and other public agencies to provide in order to undertake and complete the project.

H. Project Schedule and Timeline

A project schedule shall be provided to illustrate the interrelationships and scheduling of major project tasks. This project schedule information should be part of a Work Plan.

I. Project References

As part of the Proposer's experience information, the proposal shall include the description of the Consultants experience in performing projects similar to that anticipated in this RFP.

This reference information on past projects shall include:

1. Project name
2. Project summary
3. Inclusive project dates
4. Organization name, address, telephone and email for whom the project was performed.
5. Name, telephone number and email address of the individual in the organization who is familiar with the past project.
6. The proposed team members assigned to the past project and the work they accomplished.

Contact Person

For further information contact:

Darell Young, Project Manager
Hawaii State Department of Transportation
Highways Division, Planning Branch
869 Punchbowl Street, Room 301
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Email: darell.young@hawaii.gov
Telephone: (808) 587-1835
Fax number: (808) 587-1787

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING CONSULTANT PROPOSALS FOR HIGHWAYS DIVISION PROJECTS

The purpose of these guidelines, developed by the Hawaii Department of Transportation (HDOT), Highways Division, is to help assure fair and proper evaluation of consultant proposals by standardizing the format and content. This standardized format should reduce the time required for consultants to prepare proposals, and simplify the review process by HDOT personnel.

Each consultant proposal shall be clear, concise and follow the recommended proposal format in the scope of work (see attached), and each submittal section shall be tabbed.

As part of the evaluation process, Highways may conduct interviews with all firms showing interest in this project. And, after submitting the proposal, any change in the key personnel listed in the proposal and during the life of the contract, shall be first approved in writing by the State.

Proposals will be ranked according to the criteria and points shown in the table below. A maximum total of 100 points is available for each proposal.

PROPOSAL CRITERIA, POINTS & PAGE ALLOWANCE TABLE

Criteria	Points	Max. No. of Pages
Introductory letter, number of years in business, references and office locations.		2
Experience and professional qualifications relevant to the project.	24	
Past performance on projects of similar scope for public agencies or private industry, including corrective actions and other responses to notices of deficiencies.	22	
Capacity to accomplish the work in the required time.	20	
Innovative or alternative methods and anticipated concepts for furnishing the required services.	18	
Capable approach in developing and completing the project and understanding key issues.	16	
MAXIMUM TOTAL	100	20
Appendix: Resumes of key personnel		1 pg/person
Appendix: Company Brochure (optional)		

The number of pages per consultant proposal shall not exceed the number of pages per criteria, or the maximum total indicated in the table above. The title page, table of contents, tabs and appendices are excluded from the maximum total pages. A page is considered to be letter size, printed on one side, single-spaced, with characters no smaller than 12 point (Times New Roman font, or similar, preferred). Any proposal exceeding the maximum page limit, receives a 5-point penalty for each page over the limit.

PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS FOR PLANNING SERVICES

The criteria presented below will be used for evaluating proposals from interested consultants. The consultant receiving the highest total score will be the top ranked consultant for the project. If the total score of two or more firms are equal, past performance will be the governing criteria.

1. Experience and professional qualifications relevant to the project.

The project manager must have experience in managing projects of similar nature and scope, and shall have professional engineer(s) licensed in the State of Hawaii and/or planner(s) certified by the American Institute of Certified Planners. The project manager's resume must be included in the proposal.

The consultant shall designate experienced professional and technical staff to competently and efficiently perform the work, either through their own personnel, or sub consultants. The proposal shall identify the project team composition, project leadership, reporting responsibilities, and address how sub consultants will fit into the management structure. Resumes of the key planning team members shall be included.

The evaluation is made on the project team, and not just the consultant and consultant personnel. Information shall include experience and qualifications of the entire project team.

2. Past performance on projects of similar scope for government and public agencies, or private industry, including corrective actions and other responses to notices of deficiencies.

The consultant shall include a list of all similar projects that the consultant worked on and successfully completed and list the names of the public and/or private agencies involved, and its contact persons and his/her phone numbers.

3. Capacity to accomplish the work in the required time.

The consultant must demonstrate that sufficient knowledgeable staff is available and that any sub consultant hired by the consultant is experienced and capable of performing the work.

The consultant shall include a list of their entire workload, including HDOT and non-HDOT projects. The list should include project name, start date and estimated consultant contract completion date. In addition, the list should identify any key team members and sub consultants that are presently assigned to any of the projects listed.

4. Innovative or alternative methods, and anticipated concepts for furnishing the required services.

The consultant shall indicate any innovative, unique or alternative methods that would be used to perform the required services. Proposals should include anticipated concepts to complete the project, and should present any modern and/or cost-effective methods or special project related techniques that would benefit the project.

5. Capable approach in developing and completing the project and understanding of key issues.

The consultant shall include a work plan with work tasks that satisfies the scope of work and reflects an understanding of the key issues and capability in completing a quality project.

In accordance with the Brooks Act (U.S.C., Title 40, Chapter 11, Section 1103), written or verbal discussion will be conducted by HDOT after proposals are received.